

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT

IN RE: ALFORD V. BAYLER, et al. # 1:20-cv-1787

FILED
WILLIAMSPORT

APR 04 2023

DEPUTY CLERK
NVR
PERSTATEMENT OF FACTS TO DEM/DEFENDANTS
NOTICE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

TO THE HONORABLE, JUDGES OF SAID COURT:

PLAINTIFF ALFORD AVER PURSUANT TO LR 56.1 THAT THE FOLLOWING FACTS ARE IN DISPUTE AND THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT PLAINTIFF NOTICE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT:

- (1) ON MAY 28, 2020, I WAS CHARGED WITH 2 FELONIES AND 1 MISD. (18 § 6105 (A1), 18 § 6106 (A1), 18 § 5126 (A)) BECAUSE OF THESE INCORRECT FINDINGS THE D.A. AMENDED THE INFORMATION REMOVING 18 § 5126 (A) AND PROPERLY CHARGING 6105 AS A1 F2 (NOT F1) AND 6106 A1 (NOT A F3). AND BEFORE TRIAL ADDED 18 § 2707.1 (A) THAT I WAS FOUND NOT GUILTY OF. DESPITE THIS CASE BEING A CASE OF SELF-DEFENSE OF MYSELF AND OTHERS. (SEE DEF. EXHIBIT A; PAGE 4; DOC. 137-1).
- (2) ON JUNE 7, 2020 I WAS ARRESTED AND PLACED IN MCCF
- (3) BAIL WAS SET AT \$100,000, BUT, I DISPUTED THIS CHARGE MITIGATION AS ITS A SELF-DEFENSE CASE OF MYSELF AND OTHERS ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE D.A. (SEE PLAINTIFF EXHIBIT X-2)
- (4) PLAINTIFF HAD GROSS-IN-EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND DUE TO THIS GOT AN END VIOLATED TO PRESERVE MY RIGHTS I HAD TO FILE MY OWN PRETRIAL MOTIONS DUE TO COUNSEL FAILING TO PARTICIPATE IN PRETRIAL. (SEE DEF. EXHIBIT A; 137-H DOC.) INCLUDING \$1 BAIL TO 600 (B)(1), (B)(2).
- (5) DURING TRIAL SELECTED I ASCERTAINED AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE OF SELF-DEFENSE ON MAY 4, 2021 (M.T.) BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE WARRANTED A SELF-DEFENSE JURY INSTRUCTION. AND I WAS DENIED. WHEN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT STATED YOU CANNOT DO THIS AS IT VIOLATES THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

- (6) DISPERSE ALL ULTIMATE TRUTH IN VIOLATION OF THE GOVT WITH AGENCIES OF THE U.S. COURT / PA COURT. (IN EFFECTIVE ASSIGNMENT OF COUNSEL; A JUDGE REFUSING TO INTERVIEW THE JURY ON SELF DISPERSE; A DA WHO WITHHELD EVIDENCE TO MY FAVOR; A COUNSELLOR WHO REJECTED HER TESTIMONY "SEE EXHIBIT X-2 ENCLOSED") AMONGST OTHER THINGS I WAS FOUND GUILTY OF §605, §606. I CURRENTLY HAVE AN CLAIMS BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF PA (COMM. V. ALFORD, 9 MAY 2023; 21 MAY 2023 INCLUDING REMOVAL OF CUSTODY WHO FAILED TO RAISE ALL CLAIMS. ALSO FAILED TO PERFECT DIRECT APPEAL.
- (7) THE SENTENCE JULY 23, 2021 IS ILLEGAL BECAUSE THE MAXIMUM FOR F2 GOS IS 5-10 YEARS, ALSO FOR SENSITIVE PURPOSES GOS MUST BE DUE TO THE IMPROPER WRITING IT WITHINCE THE SENTENCE DISPERSE DEC. DAWSON SETTING HE WOULD TALK TO THE P.A. FOR LEGALITY.
- (8) I DID RECEIVE CREDIT FOR ALL TIME SERVED
- (9) I AM CURRENTLY BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT AS MY APPEAL TO THE SUPERIOR COURT WAS NOT PERFECTED NOR WAS ALL ISSUES PRESENTED PROPERLY.
- (10) THE SUPERIOR COURT DEC. 15 2022 DECISION IS IN CONFLICT WITH THE COURT, 3RD CIRCUIT, AND US SUPREME COURT IN DISPERSE
- (11) I CURRENTLY HAVE 10 CLAIMS FOR RELIEF (SEE 6 ABOVE) INCLUDING CUSTODY REMOVAL (9 MAY 2023. WHICH I SUPPORTED WITH EVIDENCE FOR THE REMOVAL (21 MAY 2023) AND I BELIEVE BE SUCCESSFUL IN THE SUPREME COURT
- (12) CUSTODY RAISED INEFFECTIVENESS. ALSO TOLD ME TO WRITE MY PRESENTATION OR I WILL BE PERSECUTED. CUSTODY HAS VIOLATED GOVT AGENCIES.
- (13) CUSTODY FAILED TO BEIN PROPER. HAS NOT REPRESENT ME IVE SECURED MY RIGHTS BY MAKING A RECORD AND CUSTODY HAS NOT REPRESENTED ME THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF MY CASE. (SEE DEC. DEC. 137-1; PAGE 7-90 WITH CITE ALFORD - GEORGE LOANED NAMES)

MY PRESENTATION WITHHELD

- (14) I WAS ARRESTED JUNE 7, 2020 AND ON JULY 9, 2020 WITHIN THE 10 DAYS AFTER THE INTERVIEW WAS FILED I FILED A PETITION CONCERNING MY CONFINEMENT AND

HAROLD BAYLOR, AND ARNOLD AND BEEN CALLED UNTIL
 FINAL I WAS TOLD "SEE MY LEGAL TEAM" CITING 57(A)
 AND CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS.

(15) WHEN MY 180 DAYS EXPIRED TO 600(B)(1) I FILED MOTION
 FOR VANCE AND HAROLD BAYLOR, AND ARNOLD AND THEN
 CAME UNTIL FINAL TOLD ME TO "SEE MY LEGAL TEAM"
 AND I FILED MY MOTION ON OR ABOUT DEC 10, 2020

(16) MY PHYSICAL INTERPRETER REFUSED 600(B)(1) NOT
 600(A) AS 180 DAY RULE, SPEEDY TRIAL EXPIRED 12.4.20
 AND COOTE, MEDINA, AND BEERS OUT OF MONROE COUNTY
 COURTHOUSE GOT \$1 BAIL SUMMER 2020 DURING
 THE PANDEMIC. THE COURT ONLY CLOSED IN COURT
 APPEARANCE DUE TO COVID-19 PANDEMIC, BUT TO
 MEET OUR CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT TO USE ACT AS
 MONROE COUNTY CORRECTORAL FACILITY WAS USING
 IP ADDRESS, GTU, ZOOM.

PANDEMIC ONLY CLOSED IN COURT
APPEARANCE AT 600(B)(1) MUST
MEET CONSTITUTIONAL
REQUIREMENTS

(17) COOTE, MEDINA, AND BEERS WAS ALSO CALLED
 AT THE BEGINNING OF THE PANDEMIC AND GOT
 \$1 BAIL TO 600(D)(2). DEFENDANTS CANNOT USE THE
 PANDEMIC TO VIOLATE MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.
 AND AS THERE EXHIBIT B7-1, PAGE 124-126 AND
 THE COURT AUTHORIZED THEM TO USE ACT IN ALL
 CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, TO MEET OUR CONSTITUTIONAL
 REQUIREMENTS AND DEFENDANTS POINT THAT THEY
 ACKNOWLEDGE PAGE 4(B) IN THERE SCHEDULES OF FIDES

(18) I ALSO SUBMITTED THE IN FEDERAL STATEWIDE
 EMERGENCY PROVIDING OUR CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS MUST BE
 MET. AND ONLY CLOSED IN COURT APPEARANCE BUT OUR
 CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS CANNOT BE VIOLATED. CITING
 6TH AND 8TH VIOLATIONS THAT BECAME EFFECTIVE 12.4.20

(19) THE 180 TIME FRAME STILL APPLIES AND IF ANY
 TRIAL WOULD BE CONDUCTED, STRICT PROTOCOLS
 MUST BE FOLLOWED: MASK, 6FT SOCIAL DISTANCING ETC.

(20) GIBBER IS MISPLACED IF HE THINKS SPEEDY TRIAL, (OTM ANEW), 'GOODBY' DOES NOT CONTRADICT WITH U.S./PA CONSTITUTIONAL. YOU CANNOT INTERFERE AT THE FED. CONSTITUTIONAL OF U.S. CITIZENS.

(21) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS THE LAW OF THE LAND AND MUST BE FOLLOWED. IF DEFENDANTS VIOLATE SUCH, IT CAN SEEK REDRESS FOR THESE CASE VIOLATIONS BY STATE OFFICIALS. GONZALEZ UNIV. V. DOE, 536 U.S. 273, 284-85 (2002) WHICH IS WHAT I DID, EXHAUSTED, WAS DENIED. THE 1983 CIVIL COMPLAINT FOLLOWED.

MY ATTEMPT TO SECURE MY
RIGHT TO A BAIL AS OTHERS
SIMILARLY SITUATED
PERSONS

(22) THE BAIL GIVEN BY ANZIALI WAS EXCESSIVE DUE TO THIS IS A CASE OF SELF-DEFENSE OF MYSELF AND OTHERS. I WAS SHOT AT AND I RETURNED FIRE WITH MY LEGALLY PURCHASED FIREARM IN SELF DEFENSE.

(23) I FILED A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ABOUT JUL, AND ON 6/10/20 DOC DOBBS' CAME TO SEE ME AND I DID NOT ASK TO SEE HIM. (SEE A.T. JUNE 10, 2020 @ 2 PM) A.T. PAGE 4, 8-21; PAGE 10, 23-11, 12 - WHO PAGE 3(1) PAGE 17, 18-23 HE STATED HE WOULD TALK TO THE D.A. BECAUSE OF MY CONSTITUTIONAL, ON 6/9/21 DOBBS' + D.A. CAME TO SEE ME UBERLINE ME THE VICTIM AND FOR 1-3 YEARS I SHOULD TESTIFY AGAINST CALL FOR REDRESS. AND BEING RELEASED AT THIS DATE.

(24) ON DEC. DOC. 1371 PAGE 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 37 (PAGE 34) I HAD NOT REMAINED TO REMOVE CUSTODY BUT FILED ON DETAIL 2022) PAGE 41 CUSTODY FINALLY FILED AFTER REMAINING PAGE 42, 43, PAGE 44, PAGE 45, PAGE 46, PAGE 47, PAGE 48, PAGE 51, PAGE 52 CUSTODY FILED, PAGE 54 CUSTODY FILED, PAGE 56, PAGE 59 I FOUGHT FOR MY INHABITED RIGHTS CITING 6TH AMENDS VIOLATION AND VIOLATION OF 'GOODBY', COURT DENIES TO 'GOODBY' AND MY REQUEST FOR BAIL MODIFICATION WAS DENIED. IN FACT I DIDN'T HAVE (1) BAIL REDUCTION, REMINDER, IF I DO NOT LOSE MY PRECUM I WILL BE FORWARDED.

(25) I FILED WAY MORE BAIL MODIFICATION WITH DIF. D-3 IN THERE STATEMENT OF FACTS @ 21. AND BECAUSE I AM BEGINNING ALL COURT ACTIONS. SPEEDY TRIAL, AND 600(B)(1), (D)(2) I WAS SEEKING MY RIGHTS AS A U.S. CITIZEN I NEVER WITHDREW.

(26) I SHOULD OF BEEN RELEASED, WAIVER, NOTIFIED
DEFENDANTS WHO DID NOTHING.

(27) I SEEK COMPENSATORY & PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR
EACH DAY/ I DID BEYOND 10 DAYS AFTER THE
INFORMATION FILED, AND FOR EACH DAY I DID
OVER 180 DAYS IN PRETENSE INFORMATION.

(28) I AM SEEKING DAMAGES FOR EVERY DAY I DID BEYOND THE TIME FRAME REQUIRED BUT AND I DO NOT SEEK MONEY DAMAGES AFTER 9.2.20 AND ~~BEFORE~~ MAY/10, 2021. I SEEK DAMAGES FOR THESE SPECIFIC DAYS AND MY CREDIT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THESE RESPECT CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS.

(29) NO, I SUED HILL, ARNOLD, AND BAYLOR, FOR HOW THEY TREATED MY CREW/ALICE, FAILED TO INVESTIGATE ACTUALS & INJURY, MINIMIZED APPROACH TO MY CLAIMS OF CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION, EXCESSIVE CONFIDENCE IN CLAIMS. AND THEY BECAME LIABLE WHEN THEY TOLD ME TO "SEE MY LEGAL TEAM."

(30) HAD AS A POLICYMAKER HAD AUTHORITY TO INTERVIEW, AS WELL AS BAYLOR AND ALUMNA'S CONCERNING MY EXCESSIVE COLLEGE MATR. CLAIMS, DID NOTHING AND THEY ARE LIABLE. THEY STOLE MY CITIZENSHIP

(31) HATOLE, ARNOLD, BAYLOR DID NOTHING, KNEW OF MY COMPLAINT, AND TRIED TO LET AS THEY EACH SIGNED MY GRIEVANCE REPLY AT 18, 21, AND 24 MONTHS.

(32) HADGE, ARUNDA, AND BAYLOR COULD & INVESTIGATED MY CLAIMS, DIDN'T, SO THEY BECAME LIABLE.

(33) IF HADGE, ARUNDA, AND BAYLOR COULD & INVESTIGATED MY CLAIMS, MADE SOME COPS, FOUND OUT WHY I DIDN'T GET MY BAIL AS COOTE, MEDINA, AND BEEBE COURT MAYBE WE COULD ALSO BE HERE, BUT THEY DIDN'T. THERE WERE ACTUAL RESULTS IN MY EXCESSIVE PRETRIAL CONFINEMENT AND VIOLATIONS OF MY 14TH AMEND RIGHTS. AS THEY HAVE A POLICY TO DELY CREDITORS BECAUSE THEY CAN.

(34) I HAVE IDENTIFIED A POLICY AND EVILANCE PROCEDURES I FOLLOWED, WAS POLICED AT ALL LEVELS, THE 1983 SUIT FOLLOWING, AND THESE DELAYS WAS THE MOVING FORCE.

(35) HERE WHERE GEESE IS COLONEL. HADGE, WARDEN P MOLF, BAYLOR RECEIVED EVILANCE REPLY, ARUNDA 2ND LEVEL REPLY, HADGE BE FINE LETTER, THIS COULD ALREADY INFERRED THAT HADGE, HAD DECIDED! WOULD AUTHORIZE TO ESTABLISH POLICY AT MOLF AND COULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING & ADOPTING A POLICY OF INACTION THAT DID NOT DEFER MISSED APPOINTMENTS AND TRIALS I FURTHER SUBMIT STATED THE 3 ELEMENTS TO PLASABLY STATE A CLAIM (1) PRISON OFFICIALS HAD KNOWLEDGE OF MY CONVICTIONS, ALSO THAT, WAS AWARE OF THE RISK THAT UNWARRANTED PUNISHMENT WAS BEING INFLICTED; (2) PRISON OFFICIALS EITHER FAIL TO ACT OR TOOK ONLY INADEQUATE ACTIONS UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES INDICATED THAT THERE RESPONSE TO THE PROBLEM WAS A PRODUCT OF DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE TO MY PLIGHT; (3) THAT THERE WAS A CAUSAL CONNECTION BETWEEN THE OFFICIALS RESPONSE, "SEE YOUR LEGAL TEAM", TO THE PROBLEM AND THE INFLICTION OF THE UNJUSTIFIABLE DECEITFUL CITING SAMPLE V. DIECKE, 885 F.2d 1110.

AND THESE ALLEGATIONS (1) FILED COMPLAINT (2) WITNESS
 BAYLOR AND ARMAID DATED TO INVESTIGATE, (3) DEF. FILED
 TO ACT, (4) TOLD ME TO SEE MY LEGAL TEAM, AND
 THIS COURT RULES THESE ALLEGATIONS SATISFIES A
 PLEADING REQUIREMENT OF A WRITABLE PRETRIAL
 DETENTION CLAIM, AND THESE INACTION CAUSED ME
 TO REMAIN IN PRETRIAL DETENTION WITHOUT A
 TIMEY APPEALMENT TO 57(A), AND PAST 180 DAYS
 TO WORK (ALSO SEE 601 AND 602/PA CASE). AND
 RELYING ON CIVIL COURT, THESE INACTION OF
 FAILURE TO TAKE ANY ACTION TO ALLEVIATE THE
 PROBLEMS, I WAS HAVING (AS OTHERS), OF DETECTIVE
 MISSED APPEALMENT, TRUTHS WHICH POLICE IMPLICATE
 MUNICIPAL LIABILITY AND EVIDENCE DESCRIBED
 INDIFFERENCE TO MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. (USE
 ACT TO MEET CONST. REQUIREMENT - IN GEN. STATE
 WIDE EMERGENCY)

(36) NO. HARROE COUNTY OFFICIALS SHOULD HAVE OF
 POLICY TO ACT ON COMPLAINTS FILED TO THEM,
 ESPECIALLY WHEN ONE IS QUOTING THE U.S.
 CONSTITUTION AND OTHERS SKILFULLY SITUATED GOT
 \$1 BAIL IN THE PANDEMIC. THEY SHOULD HAVE
 A POLICY OF ACTION, INVESTIGATED TO COMPLAINTS
 FILED TO THEM BECAUSE EVERY COMPLAINT HAS
 WEIGHT AND IS NOT FRIVOLOUS.

(37) DEFENDANT HAD THE LEGAL AUTHORITY TO TOP AND
 A POLICY OF LIMITED, MINIMALIST APPROVED, FAILURE
 TO INVESTIGATE, THEY HAVE A COMPLAINT PROCEDURE
 IN PLACE AND BECAUSE THEY DID NOTHING BUT
 TOLD ME TO SEE MY LEGAL TEAM, THEY BECAME
 LIABLE.

(38) THEY WILL NOT SUBMIT DISCOVERY, PRODUCTION OF
 DOCUMENTS, INTERVIEWERS, REQUEST FOR ADMISSION, I SUE
 THE COURT INTERVENTION. THERE MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT SHOULD BE DENIED AS THERE IS THE
 SUBSTANTIAL FACTS SUPPORT JUDGMENT IN MY FAVOR.
 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.
 CRY 4/4/23 3:16:23